

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 882

UD 018 026

TITLE Proceedings of the National Conference on Remedial/Developmental Studies in Post-Secondary Institutions.

SPONS AGENCY Chicago State Univ., Ill.

PUB DATE 17 Mar 77

NOTE 50p.; Report of Proceedings of the National Conference on Remedial Developmental Studies in Post-Secondary Institutions (Chicago, Ill., March 17-18, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education Programs; Conference Reports; *Developmental Programs; *Higher Education; Minority Groups; *Post Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Remedial Programs; Research Problems; Research Utilization; State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

This conference was called to discuss the need for, and the strategies used in, implementing basic skills remediation at the college and university level. All levels of higher education were represented, as well as research professors, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary school administrators and teachers, representatives of the business and governmental communities and individuals from the community at large. Among the issues that were discussed were whether universities should be teaching remedial courses and whether credits should be given for these courses when they are taught. It was noted that when thinking about programs of remediation, writing should be stressed instead of reading. The assumptions that guide remediation programs, and the goals of remediation programs must be carefully thought about prior and during program planning. It was noted that although universities have made an effort to seek minority students this trend has declined. In addition, although universities can be elitist with regard to their admission policies there are some that have departed radically from this position. Both of these factors shape the form of programs that intend to remediate the difficulties experienced by minority students. Furthermore, whether programs should be based on the disadvantage of students, or the differences among students is another important concern guiding remediation/developmental programs. (Author/AH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Chicago State University



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED152882

Proceedings
of the
National Conference
on
Remedial/Developmental Studies
in
Post-Secondary Institutions

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Chicago State
University

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."



Udo18026

CONVENED AT THE CONRAD HILTON HOTEL
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, MARCH 17 - 18, 1977

Under the sponsorship of
Chicago State University

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Benjamin H. Alexander, President of the University
Allan De Giulio, Vice President of Academic Affairs
Arthur J. Elbert, Vice President of Administrative Affairs
Elmer L. Washington, Vice President for Research and Development
James Doppke, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Paul Shelton, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Virginia Ford, Dean of the College of Nursing
Walter J. Heinzl, Dean of Admissions and Records
Vernon W. Brockman, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
Barbara J. Kardas, Dean of the College of Education
W. Patrick Leonard, Dean of Libraries
Stanley J. McConner, Dean of Continuing Education and Special Programs
Richard Prince, Dean of Graduate Studies
Louise Taylor, Dean of the College of Business and Administration

UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

David Ferguson, Chairperson
Eric Graham, Vice Chairperson
Jolyn Robichaux, Treasurer
James Drake, Secretary
Daryl Grisham
Walter Kotteman
Marvin Lieberman
Robert MacGregor
Gerald Maguire
Dorothy McConner
Andrew J. McGann
I. Andrew Moore
James O'Connor
Edward Palmer
Frederick Sengstacke
Thomas F. Shannon
Charles B. Stauffacher
Joseph Thomas
Benjamin H. Alexander, Executive Secretary

Allan De Giulio (Conference Chairperson)
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Stanley Jay McConner (Conference Coordinator)
Dean of Continuing Education and Special Programs

PREFACE

Between March 16 and 18, 1977, over 500 individuals gathered in Chicago from all over this country (and from Canada as well) in an attempt to shed some light on a subject of rapidly accelerating interest to the higher education community: Remedial/Developmental Studies in Post-Secondary Institutions. This conference, called to discuss the need for, and the strategies used in, implementing basic skills remediation at the college and university level drew on the talents and contributions of such well-known individuals as Harold Hodgkinson, Edgar Epps, Joseph Hannon, Jesse Jackson, and Edmund Gordon. Exciting presentations were made by Harold Delaney, Robert Green, John Roueche, Robert Worthington, Rosemary Hake, and Manford Byrd, to name a few.

All levels of higher education were represented, from James Furman and Donald Walters, representing leadership at the state level, to university presidents such as Benjamin H. Alexander, Leo Goodman-Malamuth, and Ronald Williams. Participants also included research professors, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary school administrators and teachers, representatives of the business and governmental communities, as well as individuals from the community at large.

Conference activities were highly intensive and a great many topics were addressed in the brief two-day span. Feedback on the conference was uniformly positive. The overwhelming majority of participants made it clear that they felt this first attempt at addressing the problems of basic skills remediation at the post-secondary level on a national basis should be made an annual event.

Unlike many ventures of this type, an immediate and important outcome was realized: a national association of educators involved in the provision of remedial assistance at the college level was formed at the conference. The organization has been titled the National Association for Remedial/Developmental Studies in Post-Secondary Education, and it has been quite active in setting up a communications network as well as being engaged in other activities since the conference. Copies of the first newsletter of the new association were sent to 4,000 individuals.

The following pages contain the major addresses delivered at the March conference. Not all of the presentations are reproduced herein, but the essential flavor of the conference is captured, we feel, in those papers that are included.

Many people contributed to making the conference the success it was. Of special merit were the contributions of Benjamin H. Alexander, president of Chicago State University, who had the commitment to enable Chicago State University to dedicate itself to the needs of its students with basic skills deficiencies and the foresight to encourage the implementation of this national conference; our University Advisory Council

chaired by David Ferguson whose strong assistance and participation helped raise the conference to significant heights; Stanley J. McConner, conference coordinator, who tirelessly and effectively executed all aspects of the two-day event, including the editing of these proceedings; the faculty, staff, and administrators of Chicago State University who went well beyond the expected call of duty in planning and delivery; and the more than 500 individuals whose presence and concerned involvement elevated the conference to a level not often achieved.

We, at Chicago State University, look forward to working with our colleagues around the country on a continuing basis in the name of those students who are most needful of the help of the higher education community.

Allan De Giulio
Conference Chairperson

From the Editor:

We have reproduced on the following pages the key remarks of the major speakers at the conference. Regrettably, we are unable to provide the texts of the remarks given by the following presenters:

Stephen Adolphus, Chief, Higher Education Opportunity Program,
New York State Education Department

Maureen Brannigan, Instructor of Reading, Iona College

James Briggs, Director of the Educational Assistance Program,
University of Illinois Circle Campus

Donald Bunt, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Chicago State
University

Robert Fullilove, Director of Research, New Jersey Educational
Opportunity Fund

Peyton Hutchison, President, Chicago Urban Skills Institute

Karl Lindberg, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Wayne State
University

Genevieve Lopardo, Chairperson, Department of Reading, Chicago
State University

Howard Silver, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Chicago State
University

Doris Taylor, Team Leader, Secondary Reading, Independent School
District, Dallas, Texas

Karl Taylor, Associate Professor of English, Illinois Central College

Harvey Weiner, Associate Professor of English, Pennsylvania State
University

We are grateful to the above-named individuals and others who provided their expertise in helping to make this conference a resounding success.

Stanley J. McConner
Conference Coordinator and
Proceedings Editor

CONTENTS

Preface	Allan DeGiulio	II
From the Editor	Stanley J. McConner	IV
Remarks by:		
	Benjamin H. Alexander	1
	James Furman	2
	Donald Walters	2
	Harold Hodgkinson	3
	Edgar Epps	10
	Harold Delaney	13
	John Roueche	16
	Robert Green	19
	Robert Worthington	23
	Rosemary Hake	24
	Manford Byrd	29
	Lenore Dyxin	31
	Albert Berrian	32
	Edmund Gordon	35
	Joseph Hannon	37
	Jesse Jackson	39

I do want to extend very warm greetings to you, and welcome all of you to the First National Conference on Remediation. This is a topic that people would like to sweep under the table, but we cannot. It must be on top and we must discuss it. A conference like this was just a dream and people insisted that it was the impossible dream. But nothing is impossible. Our university advisory committee offers faith that we can do anything. And I appreciate their warm support.

I feel that this conference should answer two key questions. It should answer more than those, I'm sure, but the two key questions I mention are: (1) Should universities be in the process of teaching remediation? (2) If it is taught, should credit be given for these courses?

When we first started planning this conference there was a great deal of dialogue about those two questions. Let me tell you how I presently stand and stood six months ago. First of all, universities today must teach remediation because our high schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools are not doing the job that they should. This is why we must do it. Secondly, should we give college credit for remediation? My answer is *absolutely not*. I'm in the minority on this, I know. Even my staff disagrees with me, but then honorable people can differ. Here are two things that we at beautiful Chicago State University are going to do, and the two people that I report to are here and are going to hear me say it. I will say it loud and clear. As soon as Chicago State University can get out of the business of giving remediation, we are going to do it. It is wrong that we should be in this and we're going to get out of it.

The last thing I want to say, and I say this from the bottom of my heart, is that it is commendable that Chicago State University is leading the way in this area, but it's reprehensible that we have to do so. That is my story and throughout this conference you will have an opportunity to agree or disagree with me. I will be in and out of these sessions and I will be happy to debate the issue with you. But, from this point on, people who are experts will discuss this issue. You're here to take the word back to your communities. I welcome you, and God Bless you. We're here to do a very important task. Thank you very much.

James Furman, Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education

We, at the state level, look upon the question of remediation with some perplexity in terms of its place within the college and university structure, in terms of the role of institutions, and in terms of the transition that we think is so important between the high school graduate and the college and university student. Clearly in this state, beautiful Chicago State University, indeed, has been the leader, addressing the issues and setting the focus in talking about the philosophical context in which we must address the role of the state and the role of our colleges and universities in remediation. Dr. Alexander and his people have come to us in the last few years for support for remediation. We provided support, and not nearly as much as Dr. Alexander would like. The problems Chicago State University and the Board of Governors have so cogently outlined are the tasks that they face in this question of preparation for college and university work.

I'm pleased to be a part of this conference as well as to be an observer because I think that the kinds of things that you're talking about and the kinds of conclusions that you reach will have extremely important and immediate consequences in the state of Illinois, as well as in the states which you represent.

Donald Walters, Executive Officer of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities of Illinois

If I could take a liberty with Robert Hutchins, I would like to loosely paraphrase something I think he once said; "The purpose of a university education is not to prepare the student for something; it's to prepare him/her for anything." I think that the fact that the character of higher education has changed so dramatically since World War II has placed a tremendous burden on our universities in trying to redefine what that "anything" is. Somebody quoted recently that at the end of World War II there were about six million people studying in institutions of higher education. Today, the sense of sheer numbers has contributed, I think, to the change in character both of our institutions, and what goes on within them. It has contributed, indeed to the sense of confusion and schizophrenia about what we should be—either all things to all people, or which things to which people. The recognition, I think, that we are dealing in another world in 1977 than we dealt with in 1947 is important. It comes home most sharply to us when we realize how many of the students who wish to cross our threshold are already seriously disabled. They do not possess the minimum competencies in the areas which our

society puts such values on, or the obvious skills which people in this audience are concerned with. People who can write and read and do that effectively in this society are the people who still command attention. These people have a competitive edge, both in the quality of their thinking and in the market place.

There is a very special challenge in this new and perhaps strange world in which we find ourselves in the mid 1970's. The challenge is to try to deal sympathetically and effectively with the needs of a group of college bound students who aspire to the kind of educational opportunity that we have preached over the last couple of decades. We must then deal with those aspirations in a way that does not cheat the students out of a quality education, that will indeed prepare them for anything, and not just for something.

There is a parable that I might use in trying to describe my own personal sense of commitment to the effort that is reflected in the title of this conference. It has to do with the two Americans who were visiting the Moscow zoo. When they came across a cage in which they saw a large brown bear and a small lamb they were stunned that the Russians had somehow accomplished this feat of having a lamb and a bear live in peaceful co-existence in the same cage. They called the zoo keeper to explain it. The zoo keeper said, "Well, of course, this is simple proof that international cooperation can work. It is evidence that it can be successful." He then looked around to see if anybody was listening and whispered, "but, of course, we have to change the lamb everyday." I think, if I can extrapolate from that, I'd like to suggest that the concern of all of us is not to let the lamb of remedial/developmental studies be destroyed by the traditions of the academy which moves students in another direction and on another track. That is a challenge, I know, that all of you face daily and year by year in your work. It is a challenge that Chicago State University, under Ben Alexander's leadership, has accepted. It is one which I strongly support. I hope that I can stand not face to face with, but side by side with some of you in finding ways to continue to sustain that effort, and to find sources of support for it.

Harold "Bud" Hodgkinson, Director of the National Institute of Education

First of all, let me present some data that you have not seen before, largely because I just got it together last week. One of the things everybody wants to know is how bad are colleges today? Of course, the answers vary enormously. In terms of conscientious work, interest and motivation, it is quite clear that it is only a small percentage of college teachers, about 18 per cent, who feel that their students are less conscientious than they used to be. In terms of their background in humanities and social science, only about 13 per cent of the college and

and university teachers report that their students are less well prepared. So it does not appear that in humanities and social sciences, and those are the areas in which one quite often has to engage in a lot of fairly heavy reading, that there is a problem. In mathematics, things get a little tougher. About 33 per cent of the faculty indicate that their students are less well prepared than they have been in the past. And it gets steadily worse, with the one exception of science in which about 17 per cent of the science faculty report that their students are less well-prepared than they have been in the past. I thought that was interesting. Apparently math has been a problem, but science has not been so much a problem. It may well be that certain of the mathematical curricula that are taught in the public secondary schools are not always required, nor relevant even, to the many courses in science, particularly in the ecological side of biology and areas of that sort. Now when you get to reading skills, about 45 per cent of the faculty report that their students are not as efficient in reading and comprehension as they have been in the past. Most important and interesting to me was this one, because we always stress reading. If you look at writing skills, about 60 per cent of the college and university faculty surveyed indicate that their students are not writing as well as they used to, a much higher percentage than reading. So when we think about remediation, we have to think about what it is we have to remediate and, it seems to me, we tend to stress reading and we do not stress writing. Writing is not a terribly important part of American culture, even though much of the research on reading and writing indicates that there is a great deal of commonality between learning one and learning the other.

So, when you think about what needs to be done in terms of remediation, this is a small survey of what college teachers tell us they are finding, and I think that you might find that useful information as you proceed. I, also, have a lot of information about test score declines, but I would rather not talk about that, partly because I am tired of talking about it and secondly because you may have some far more interesting questions than my material.

The National Institute of Education has been in existence for about five years. The current budget is \$70 million. We do our granting in six major problem areas. We are not organized by elementary, secondary, and higher education. Rather, we are organized around six problems that we consider to be crucial to American educational life. The most important for you is the Basic Skills group. This is the group that is responsible for reading, writing, math skills, and things of that sort. Primarily we are involved in research and prototype development. We are not the Office of Education, with its \$6 billion. We have about \$70 million; we have to make our dollars go far, and therefore, we support prototype development only. We have a large Dissemination and Resources group. State

capacity grants are now running about \$6 million. The Finance and Productivity group is looking for ways of increasing utility and effectiveness of instruction. We have a fairly heavy computer assisted instruction and research program and do a lot of work in school finance, including postsecondary educational finance. We run the University of Mid-America, which some of you may know about, and we also run the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. The School Capacity for Problem Solving group is a group that tries to encourage local teachers to develop their own talents through teacher centers and networks. The Education and Work group is very interested in the relationship between basic skills and remediation as it relates to careers, and I think that is the group that has a lot of implications for your conference today. We have the Education Equity group. I am delighted that Harold Delaney is here from the Education Equity group, because he can answer questions about the program after I have left. If you write for our brochure, you will find that we did a rather courageous thing in the back. We listed every person with his telephone number who gives away money. So if you have a complaint about a grant proposal you know who it is that you have to talk to.

The last thing about NIE I want to mention is that it runs the ERIC system, which is Education Research Information Clearinghouses. There are seventeen of them, five of which have major implications for remediation. The ERIC system is the most widely used information base in the United States; there are well over 10 million uses per year. In addition, we have done searches on the most important topics. Those searches are in areas that I think could be related to your concern. For example, there are 143 sources in the literature on reading achievements, blacks, disadvantaged students, and factors that influence failure. That is 143 different sources and they are all summarized in 200 word abstracts so that you can get an easy handle on the field. The utility and cheapness of ERIC, if you know what you want to look for, can not be over-emphasized, particularly for people who are seriously interested in questions of remediation. There is a lot of literature already developed, and I am constantly surprised at people who re-invent the wheel or go at the literature in their own way.

How does the government spend its research and development money? It should come as no big surprise to you that national defense takes 52 per cent of the government's \$21 billion that is invested in research and development every year. One of the reasons national defense is so popular with Congress is that when Congress funds research, like a new laser beam navigation system, it not only funds it in the sense that it gives away the money, but it buys back the product of the research, in the form of the new navigation system for the B-1 Bomber. So the government not only buys the research, it buys the product of

research, so it makes a nice complete circle. That is not true in many other areas, and indeed, as you go down the list you find that as the government procures less on the side of the output of research and development, the amount of money in that area goes down. In health, for example, we only spend about 8.6 per cent of that \$21 billion and you have to go way down the chart before you get to education—about 1 per cent. One of the reasons is that the government does not buy any of the products of that research. If research produces some new remedial textbooks, that does not make any difference to the government. No one is going to get re-elected because of that. That will not create many new jobs in a senator's state. On the other hand, if that B-1 Bomber contract comes back with the laser beam navigation system and that goes to a firm in, say California, that obviously is going to make two senators very happy. So there is a political advantage in funding research that you can buy back the consequences of and that is not true in the case of education. That, then, is how the government generally spends its research and development dollars.

It is interesting to look at where the public says that it would like research and development money to go. This study was done by the National Science Foundation, so you know it is right. The people would like more research in health, environment, crime prevention — which takes only half of one per cent of research and development dollars, and education. Compare that to how we are spending research money and you can see what we refer to in the trade as an inverse correlation. That is, the more people want it, the less the government spends for it. It is very important, then, in thinking about the federal role, to realize how government priorities are set. They are set not only based on the Congress' view of the importance in the sense of public interest, but their priorities have to do with some relatively pragmatic factors, such as the jobs this will create in my state or my district or the people who will be immediately benefited by this investment as compared to another investment. In terms of educational research and development funds, unlike agriculture and medicine, the federal government is by far the dominant contributor. Of the approximately \$617 million that is spent on educational research and development, including remediation, \$517 million comes from the federal government. Now the government only provides about 8 per cent of our total education budget, a very small percentage. We spend \$120 billion on education in this country every year; it is our largest single industry. It is the full-time occupation of about 60 million people including students, and it is big business. Yet, we spend only one-half of one per cent of that total investment on trying to find out how it works, and how it might be made to work better, and why. Agriculture spends between four and six per cent, medicine six to eight per cent, and any business I've ever heard of runs on at least a 10 per cent R and D

figure. So here we have \$120 billion, our big national investment in education, and we spend less than one-half of one per cent trying to figure out how we can make it better. That is food for thought.

The other thing about the federal role you have to remember is that, although it is small, 8 to 10 per cent, it is not concentrated or focused on any particular collection of areas. The government's policies in education are relatively underwhelming. That is, the policies are not informed decisions to reject certain kinds of educational activity. The government simply does not work that way. Congress votes a bill up or down. It has very little opportunity, due to the congressional process, to compare one bill with another. There is no committee I know of that allows the immediate and instantaneous comparison of one bill with a competing bill to see which might produce the greater benefits. All you need is a group of avid followers and a march on Washington, and you have a pretty good chance of getting a couple million dollars. That is slightly overstated, but not as much as I wish it were. Bills are written in response to public pressure. Each represents a distinct pressure group in American life. They have gone to Washington, they have done their homework, and they have emerged with a bill. The bill has allowed funding of certain programs that benefit their constituency and that is how the educational programs and the federal government have grown.

One final general thing about the federal role. For no particular reason, we are now spending twice as much on libraries as we are on bilingual education. We are spending 35 times as much on aiding college students as we are on educational programs for illiterate adults. We are spending 20 times as much on direct educational service programs as we are on all education research and development and dissemination put together, and so on. So as you go down the list you begin to wonder, when you think of comparative choices, who decided that we should spend twice as much on libraries as we do on bilingual education? Who decided that was a federal priority? Who decided that only the federal government could support libraries? The answer is nobody. So we have some problems in the sense of a coherent federal role. Here are a few federal programs that I looked up in the last few days just to give you some handle on where the money goes, because I think what you may really want to know, in addition to the role questions I have just been discussing is where the money goes. That is what everybody wants to know. The rough estimate I came up with is over \$50 million. That is, every year the government spends over \$50 million helping adults learn how to read, write and do mathematical problems if they are currently incapable of doing so or if they are doing so at a very low level. The Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education spends between \$11 and \$14 million every year doing quite a bit of work in innovative and unusual programs at community colleges and places like Empire State in New

York, Minnesota Metropolitan State College, El Verno, and a number of small colleges, particularly those that have a major thrust of the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. They are a small agency; they give small grants; they do not support research; they are not interested in finding better ways of teaching people to read or write. They provide program support data for institutions that think they have a particular view on the problem. Title III is probably the largest of these and I think you're familiar with it, the developing institutions programs; it has a long and illustrious history and has been around for years. My last official study before I went to Washington, when I was still at Berkeley, was the study of Title III, which some people still use for the purpose of getting money. It is called "How Much Change for a Dollar." Title III is supposed to develop institutions so that they join the mainstream of American higher education." The study indicates how Title III monies have been spent over the life of Title III and what the net gains have been.

The most important thing about Title III for you in a basic program and in the AIDP, if you are that far, is faculty development in curriculum. That is, awards are significantly large for retraining so that faculty can do well in technical remedial courses. There are very few programs that train faculty at the college level today for remediation work. I do not know how people get that set of skills and that is a very definite set of skills. But at any rate, Title III will help you do that. In addition, there is a large amount of Title III money that is going into development of remedial curricula. The basic program, which is about \$50 million, has worked very hard in that area. Title III, of course, has a publication and it will tell you how they give away their money.

In the U.S. Office of Education, there is a division of adult basic education. This is mostly dollars that go to the LEAS, that is, local education agencies, individuals, schools, and school systems. There is not a great deal of money that goes to colleges and universities out of that division. These are primarily program dollars; they are not research dollars, so that if you have a better way of teaching reading to people that do not know how to read, it probably would not be the best place to go. Defense, of course, is one of our most illustrious neighbors in the federal hierarchy. They spend at least \$10 billion a year on remediation efforts, but they have nothing to do with colleges and universities. They spend \$8 million a year to improve the quality of their manuals. And as you know, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corp. have stacks of these manuals. They often seem to have been written by newly arrived immigrants from Switzerland. So the priorities, I think, are quite interesting. The government's Department of Defense had decided to spend \$8 million improving the quality of the writing and \$8 million on improving reading skills. It originally put a lot of money into getting people to read better and then discovered that the material these people were reading

was junk. I think it is commendable for the department to realize that it has to make a major effort to revise the manuals. If any of you recall the army manual on "How to Clean Your Rifle," you remember that by using the techniques recommended in that manual, you would be killed immediately. As I recall, the first thing it says is that you have a little wad of silicone and a rag. Nobody in field conditions is going to have silicone around, but the manual does not suggest that possibility. The manuals have been rewritten with flow charts and there is a set of steps and there are some arrows that take you from one step to the next and there are four times as many pictures as there used to be. There are also grids, so that you can see how one set of factors relates to another set of factors. So we are beginning to learn a lot through DOD on how to set up instructional materials that people can understand. There are some reading problems in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard, just to be fair to all concerned, but it is interesting to note that DOD decided to put their dollars on improving the quality of the written material. In Labor there are a lot of programs in functional reading for adults, but they are fundamentally job-related. That is, they are remediation programs offered in the work place, not back at colleges and universities.

It is interesting to note, then, as I indicated when I began, that over half the federal money is going to the improvement of reading on the part of adults, but the place in which this is going on is not a college or a university. For reasons that I am not sure of, but can only speculate about, the government has decided that colleges and universities are not terribly good places to help people learn how to read and write or to help them read and write better. At the National Institute of Education we have a fairly large program of research on reading. It is about \$19 million, our total effort in this area, and we are emphasizing math, reading, and writing. We are particularly concerned with the minimal competencies that more and more states are establishing for the high school degree. We see this as an opportunity or as a threat. Many state legislatures that pass minimal competency standards for the high school diploma have not thought through what they are going to have. The minimal competency represents a ceiling or a floor. Does a really good student do the minimal competency and then stop? If not, what propels the student to do more? There are a number of questions of that sort that we are interested in. We have supported a Center for the Study of Reading at the University of Illinois. We are quite proud of it. It is a million dollar per year grant and we have a Center for the Study of Research on Teaching at Michigan State. That also is a multi-million dollar project. In both cases, we insist that public school teachers be active members of the faculty. The faculty must include professional staff from the public schools, because we think that is where a lot of practical knowledge is. The Bureau of Correction does some work in remediation, although not much.

That is a fairly good summary, the best I could do for the federal government, regarding remediation.

Edgar Epps, Marshall Field Professor of Urban Education, University of Chicago

When one proposes to discuss a topic such as the place of remedial or developmental education programs on the college or university campus, it is helpful, especially if one is a sociologist, to begin by looking at the set of assumptions that guide the discussion or the approach. I start with the assumption that through most of the history of American higher education, colleges and universities have been engaged in a process of screening out, sorting out, and selecting persons in accord with a particular system of social stratification. The education system in the United States may be characterized as a contest mobility system which is developed in a modern industrial society where class conflict has been submerged within a single market for cultural respectability. This is a characteristic of a multi-ethnic society dominated by a particular ethnic elite and in our case, of course, this was WASP. In such a society, class differences are subordinated to divisions among competing ethnic groups. Inflation of educational credentials is especially likely in such a contest mobility system. For example, the United States has experienced this kind of educational inflation since, at least, the middle of the 19th century. At the same time, educational requirements for employment at all levels have increased correspondingly. Recent reaction to this trend suggests that university attendance will decline during the next decade if inflation of credentials outstrips the corresponding educational requirements for employment. In the meantime, however, blacks and other non-white minorities view higher education as a means of gaining the credentials that are still very much a requirement for social mobility through the occupational structure. This discussion, therefore, is concerned with the impact of a new student population on college campuses, where the initial arrangements have catered to the needs and cultural styles of white middle-class students.

The enrollment of relatively large numbers of students who do not share many of the traditional goals of these institutions raises a serious question about the function of higher education in the American society. The new population includes many students who differ from the mainstream college student in social and economic backgrounds, career plans, and academic behavioral patterns. Since college environments have been arranged on the assumption that the bulk of the student body will be white and middle-class, these new students constantly find themselves faced with a struggle for survival in a world created for someone

else. Among the assumptions with which I operate is the belief that those formerly excluded minorities and lower class persons who desire to enter the occupational mainstream through higher education should have a realistic chance to realize their aspirations. If blacks and other minorities are to attain educational parity with whites, and I do think this is a desirable goal for society, large portions of students from low income backgrounds will have to attend college.

While considerable strides in this direction have been seen in the past decade, the gap is still wide and cannot be closed unless access to college education is broadened and institutional supports are strengthened. The United States Bureau of Census reports impressive gains in minority college attendance during the last decade. But we must keep in mind that much of this increase represents students who are in the early years of college, those involved in non-credit courses, as well as those who are in the four-year colleges working toward degrees. Many of those in the two-year colleges will not go on to become four-year college graduates. Many of the students in four-year colleges will become casualties due to financial, academic, and personal adjustment problems. In other words, if the goal is educational parity for formerly excluded groups, there has to be a focus on retention and graduation as well as on access. I think it is extremely important and significant that most of the recent increase in black enrollment in higher education has taken place in traditionally white institutions. Such institutions now enroll about three-fourths of all black students. Still, those 100 or so predominantly black colleges, which enroll about one-fourth of the total black student population, are still graduating 50% of the black persons who get college degrees.

As Jenks and his associates have pointed out in his book *Inequality*, it is educational attainment that has the greatest bearing on occupational success. Thus, graduation is much more important than attendance. Indeed graduation and the acquisition of credentials seem to be more important than the grades the student achieves or the quality of the institution attended. Thus, the issue is how many will graduate, or put another way, how committed are colleges and universities to the goal of providing the resources required to assure the complete education of most of the lower class and minority students who are recruited and admitted? How does the goal of equal access to higher education and equal opportunity to complete that education successfully fit into the traditional role of the university?

The traditional American university, based on the model of the elite private universities, was viewed as a repository of knowledge, as a place where scholars and researchers pursued the development of new knowledge, and where the children of the elite spent their late adolescence acquiring the social skills and social contacts requisite to the leadership roles they were expected to play in later life. Status, position,

and power were thus passed on from generation to generation to white males, of course, through the matriculation of the sons of the elite at elite universities. The meritocratic system was later introduced to permit a broadening of the recruitment pattern of leadership as the society's industrial system required a wider range of skills and a larger proportion of educated manpower than could be provided by the sons of the elite. The role of the university in the formation of knowledge was closely related to the needs of the industrial society but also closely related to the maintenance of the cultural superiority of the descendants of Anglo-Europeans. Now, what this suggests to me, is that much of the traditional role of the university and the university professor was based on a set of assumptions that stemmed from this elitist bias and a not too subtle alliance with industry. In other words, exclusion was one traditional bias, with service to industry the other primary moving factor. If one moves from that set of biases to a set of assumptions which includes a belief that access to university education, and to the jobs that result from the completion of such education, is a major role of the university, then the university's role still includes an alliance with industry and the knowledge production function. But it excludes the exclusion function and the Anglo-European bias in the curriculum and the selection process. In other words, the goal of the university is developing individual potentials. Admission should provide equality of opportunity to those students who have the greatest potential to benefit, not merely in academic terms, but in terms of self-actualization, personal growth and change, and realization of aspiration. Now what this means, in essence, is that we can look at the role of the university as being one which provides an opportunity for the development of human potential, rather than a place where we sort, select, and screen in the service of an industrial society.

Many compensatory programs have been criticized as unimaginative and ineffective paternalistic enterprises. In fact, a student at one university called those programs, noble-savage programs, because they did contain a type of condescension which was so blatant that only the most blind person would not have been struck by it. What we should encourage, instead, is the development of programs based on the idea of competence, designed to help students gain competence in areas that are relevant to their personal development. Now, one scheme or theoretical model which might apply here is that which was developed by Professor Benjamin Bloom at the University of Chicago, and that is the idea of mastery learning. This general idea assumes that all students can learn all of the material that is necessary or needed, if it is properly organized and properly presented in an effective manner. The basic idea in this program is that the major differences in what we think of as aptitude are really the amounts of time the student needs to learn a par-

ticular set of materials. There is the assumption that much material is of a sequential nature, and that if one provides students with an opportunity to acquire the prerequisite skills, then they can be moved sequentially from one phase to another. At the end of the process, the students are mastering materials at a standard of excellence which is only attained by students to whom we now give "A." In fact, Bloom argues, if it is done properly, we could have 80 per cent of the entering class performing at the level that the top 10 per cent now performs. He argues that we are not really talking about a program of remediation, but a program of effective education. That if we were to organize our instructional programs properly, all our students would be coming out operating at very high standards of excellence.

Another sociologist, William Spadey, has raised the disturbing question, "What the hell would American society do with all those bright, eager, motivated people?" But that is another discussion. For this program to be implemented successfully in colleges, considerable revision of current conceptions about the functions of colleges and universities will be required. One of the requirements will be that we get away from the notion that ability is somehow distributed in the real world like a bellshaped curve. We have to come to the understanding that all of our students can do excellent work if we provide them with the requisite opportunity.

Harold Delaney, Associate Director, Educational Equity Group of the National Institute of Education

It would have been helpful, as I comment, if Dr. Epps had said something with which I thoroughly disagreed. As I listened to him, though, rather carefully and noted points of major agreement, it occurred to me that what I might do is to begin by telling you that I spent twenty one years of my professional life at Morgan State College, where back in 1950 we consciously decided we were going to initiate a well-formalized and organized compensatory education program. We may have been among the first to utilize that term.

I'll show the relationship between that and what Dr. Epps outlined in a moment, but when I first became associated with Morgan State, it was an open door institution in the sense that any person who was a graduate of any high school in the state of Maryland was eligible for admission. Now, that created problems for faculty who were not prepared to deal with the variety of students who came in under those circumstances. It was clear to us that we could not deal effectively with that great variety of students unless we sat down and worked out a sensible coordinated program to take into account a diversity of student body.

So around 1950, we developed what was, at the time, of some interest, and what some people will now pejoratively refer to as a tracking program. We had to take into account that our students did come to us with a wide diversity of backgrounds. I want to talk about the admissions and about what happened to those students. In talking about what happened, I will try to relate it to some of the points that Dr. Epps presented.

We changed our admissions criteria slightly. What we said was that any student who graduated from any high school within the state of Maryland and who ranked within the upper three-fourths of that high school class would be admitted without any further credentials. We also recognized that there were those who finished in that bottom quarter of their high school classes who probably could make it, if we could just find out who they were. We admitted them if their ACT score was near the median score of the preceding freshman class. Then we developed three separate curricula which took into account the fact that those students who scored lowest on the ACT and had the lowest high school averages were going to need a longer period of time to succeed. We developed what we called a three curricular plan in which about 50% of every freshman class entered with special conditions imposed upon them. One condition was the remedial program. We had a great debate among the faculty about whether we were going to give academic credit . . . this was nearly thirty years ago . . . for remedial programs. The compromise that we reached was that instead of simply calling the program remedial English, we would insist that students attend classes five days a week for three semester hours of credit. The theory was that with the extra two days a week, we could provide the extra instruction that would do both the remediation and the standard instruction.

The first year of experience taught us that, even under those circumstances, some would not necessarily make it. The English department had a stroke of genius then. They said that anybody who failed the first semester of freshman composition would automatically have that grade waived. What the English department did was to introduce the following system: they gave an "A", "B", "C" and "U." They eliminate the "D" and the "F" grade. The inference was that if more than 50% of our students were enrolled in a remedial program to begin with, we were going to have a lot of failures within a very short period of time. So the consequence was, that those students who actually made a grade less than "C" in that freshman composition course were assigned a grade of "U." That grade of "U" was treated as if the student had never enrolled in the course before, or was not enrolled in the course. The students in this example were limited to twelve semester hours of work. They could not take more than that under any circumstances.

Now on the second go round, the students had to achieve at the level of "C" or higher, otherwise they received an "F." This was one of the

techniques utilized to make it possible for the students to remain in college long enough to pick up the skills. Through association with other students they increased the probability that they would succeed. We do know that the longer they stayed in college, even though they may have been just making it, the greater was the probability they would achieve satisfactorily and would eventually graduate. We know that, historically, at that institution over 80% of our students required more than eight semesters to graduate. There are a lot of reasons for that, not all academic. A great many problems were financial, personal, and so on.

The other two curricula I will mention very briefly to round the story out. There was a regular Morgan State academic program made up of students who we felt could proceed in a normal progression towards the baccalaureate degree. Then, there was a fairly small group of about fifty or sixty students, sometimes more, sometimes less, who, on the basis of all the evidence we had at hand, were high achievers. We developed a special program for them.

What I have said begins now to be related in some way to Dr. Epps' presentation. The secret is that, despite all of the academic gimmicks that we had utilized, the most important ingredient in that compensatory education program was the counseling program. If we had not had at that institution a very skilled and dedicated counseling staff, none of this would have worked well at all.

In the first place, we had the task of dealing with students' psychological problems when they learned that they were going to be placed in a specialized curriculum where they were limited to twelve semester hours and would have to take many remedial programs. What one had to do in the counseling effort was to convince them that without those limitations, we could guarantee that they would flunk. On the other hand, we could not guarantee that they would be successful, but we knew we could guarantee that they would flunk out if we did not give them that kind of opportunity. We tried not to accuse them of being stupid or ignorant, but that we were trying to provide them with a chance that we thought would greatly enhance their opportunities. In talking about remedial education, there is a problem we always have to face; how to deal with that psychological trauma that many people have when they realize that they are in such a situation.

Now, let me talk about the use of faculty in counseling. I think the comment that Dr. Epps made about students becoming very closely associated with faculty is of awfully high importance. As a matter of fact, in the *Journal of Chemical Education* there is a series of interviews with some of the world's most outstanding chemists. In almost every instance, you find that someone had taken the individual being interviewed in hand somewhere along the line. It is a very important point. But at the same time, I think it is a mistake, after some twenty years of having dealt with it,

to assume that faculty can do that kind of counseling. As a matter of fact, I am confident that there are some faculty who are constitutionally unprepared to do that kind of counseling. I do not mean that we should hold them in disrepute, necessarily, because I think we have a diversity of faculty on our campuses and I think that diversity is legitimate. But we do have to take into account that there is a professional skill and there is a sense of dedication that goes with the kind of counseling that we are describing. I do not know any way to get around that.

Whenever we talk about remedial education, the big question university presidents must face is how much will it cost. The fact is that I am not sure if we really know what it costs us. I am not so sure that we have an adequate comparison between the cost of effective remedial developmental education programs as compared to the cost of the so-called regular programs. I would like to see some better analysis of this.

Another point that I think about is the fact that as we increase the amount of time that is available to these remedial students, we increase the probability of success. I would think that one of the things that we can do is to make use of technology in the sense that we do know that increased time means that students have a greater opportunity for repetition and greater opportunity to check their progress. Technology makes it possible to multiply the repetition experience of these students many times, while at the same time holding the cost down. You do not replace faculty, but you do not have to bring in as many faculty as you would if you were to use human beings in that repetitive sense.

Finally, I would very strongly agree that we must adhere to standards at exit. That is where we want to give the student an opportunity to be successful. I think we can say it forcefully and directly that he or she will have demonstrated an ability to achieve at a certain level. It was the school's concern that it does all that it can do to make sure the student gets there.

John Roueche, Professor and Director of the Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas

We have all kinds of data that document what Dr. Epps said. We know that students learn best if you organize curriculum around three class meetings a week. We have been doing that for hundreds of years. Two hundred years ago a study was done that showed that if we could break the content into three class sessions a week, that was the maximum experience and a guarantee that we had done it well. We did extensive research during the 19th century and found that if you give everybody the same amount of time, fifteen weeks, they would learn the content, and so forth and so on. The very idea that we ought to be giving more

time, that we ought to change the matrix that we have operated on for two hundred years makes a lot of sense to me.

I guess that there are two or three things I would like to say, not at all to react, but to support and reaffirm what has been said this morning. In the study that we have just completed of three hundred college and university programs for developmental, basic, advanced, applied, and general studies programs, we found eighty-four different terms used to describe programmatic efforts to treat students who do not read, write, speak, listen or figure very well. We found that today, every public university is up to its armpits with students who do not read and write. Part of the irony of Dr. Eppe's remarks is that selective universities like Berkeley, Stanford, Ohio State, and the University of Texas are more egalitarian in their philosophy, in their efforts to recruit the best (whatever that means) students today than they ever have been. All the screening procedures today are yielding thousands of youngsters who can not read and write well enough to pass a California transfer English course.

Stanford University admits only valedictorians and salutatorians from the nation's best high schools. In fact, 60% of the freshmen there come from the nation's best prep schools, and guess what you find in Stanford today... five thousand students enrolled in their learning assistance center, reading on the 9th grade level and the 10th grade level. They have had all the courses, and they have gotten all "A's" on their transcripts. Now do not mistake me; students now being found in those university settings have skills problems, but they probably do not have a motivational problem or the self concept problem such as you would find in more egalitarian open door institutions. In the study that we finished, 40% of all public universities today admit in writing, publicly, in the catalogues, that they are open door institutions.

I guess another thing I would like to say is that we have had the idea for a long time that American higher education has always been selective. It probably has been in that it served the sons and daughters of those who had the economic resources to send their children to college. In Pat Cross' new book, *Accent on Learning*, which I recommend to you because she has an excellent chapter on learning variables that promote success among nontraditional students, she points out that Wellesley College, as far as anybody can determine, offered the first remedial course in 1894. Harvard University followed shortly thereafter, and by 1920, almost every college offered those services. It was only after World War II, and the tremendous onslaught of students in the sixties, that we began screening, that is eliminating from consideration anybody with a learning problem, and only now, when the reality of the economic supply and demand curve has hit us again, are we rediscovering this new market of individuals in our society without the skills necessary to succeed in college or to succeed in the real world.

I suppose one of the tragedies about 1977 is, as Toffler says so eloquently in his chapter on education in *Future Shock*, that it used to be that failure in school did not predetermine one to failure in the larger context of society. But today, failure in school relates very heavily to success in the larger society, because individuals in our society today who do not have job skills that qualify them for the kinds of technical level employment that are currently available, are going to be losers. They are going to be on welfare, they are going to be unemployed, or they are going to be in jail. In Texas we spend 3-1/2 times the amount of money keeping an individual in the state penitentiary as we do keeping him or her in an open door public community college. Now, I do not know who, in their wisdom, make those kinds of decisions about which is a better social service, but we do not have a lot of options. Things are worse today than they were five years ago because five years ago universities did not have those kind of problems with the students they admitted. But, also, public school attrition has increased since 1957. Despite the massive billions of dollars provided at the federal level for elementary and secondary education, there are more students dropping out of the public sector than there has been since the end of World War II. All estimates are that thirty-five per cent of all first graders will never graduate from an American public high school. If those youngsters happen to be black or brown, the figures go between sixty to seventy per cent. Those are national figures.

Now, what are the opportunities? Where will those people go in our society? What will they do? What skills will they have? Will they be able to feed their families? Will they be able to get a job? Will they be productive, contributing members of our society? I guess a question that I would like to ask is what is being done to bring about improvement in the quality of teaching in elementary and secondary education. I do not see any. All the evidence is that things are worse today than they were ever before. In Texas, the average college freshman is reading on the 9th grade reading level. An English teacher in any class can expect ninth grade levels on reading ability in any college English course. Now, what textbook does he or she use? What method of teaching does he or she use? One of the things that Ben Bloom does not get at, although he infers it a lot, is the *what* question. Instruction is a *how* question; how are we going to accomplish the objectives we set? With the kinds of students that we are finding in colleges today, that *what* question, in my view, is infinitely more important than the *how* question. That is, what is it we want these students to learn? Are we going to let them learn only that literature is written on a small group of islands off the western coast of Europe, or are we going to open the curriculum a little bit to get at some value bases they have? The value base of the student is an important place to begin content design at the college level. The second base is

that which Dr. Hodgkinson alluded to this morning, as did Dr. Epps, and that is the utility value. If we can give students information content skills they can use today, this afternoon, tomorrow morning, our chances of their remembering them, valuing them, are fantastic. That forgetting curve does not have to drop off if the content you have taught is useful to the owner. If it is useful, we choose to remember.

Robert Green, Dean, College of Urban Development, Michigan State University

I would like to reinforce much of what has been said by our main speaker, Dr. Epps, and the other two reactors. One or two observations might be appropriate. I agree very much with Dr. Epps that for a period of time universities were accelerating their efforts to recruit blacks, Spanish speaking, and native American students throughout the country. However, a close look at recent recruitment and enrollment efforts reported by universities throughout the country indicates that this is no longer the case. Major universities, such as Harvard, Michigan State, Illinois, and Northwestern have recently seen a decline in minority and black student enrollment.

To a great extent, I think we sometimes forget that universities very often reflect the values of the broader society. During that period, post 1966, and especially after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., there was a major effort on the part of universities to recruit black and other minority students. With the Nixon-Ford administration and the development of a new set of trends within higher education, there was a change in that effort.

Secondly, regarding the elitist posture of universities in America, I do support Dr. Epps in his belief that large universities have established a very elite posture in terms of their admissions policies. But I would like to indicate, too, that there are some universities that have departed dramatically and radically from that position, although the impact on the minority community was almost nil. Let me take the university with which I am most familiar. Michigan State University is a land grant institution. You have one in this state. The University of Illinois is a land grant institution, established in 1852 under the Morrill Act. The philosophy underlying that act was that the land grant institution should depart from the elite posture of the Princetons, the Harvards, the Yales, and admit the children of the poor. While recently reading the history of the 100 years of Michigan State University's growth and development, I found that that was exactly what Michigan State University did. When World War I ended, large numbers of young white males were admitted to Michigan State University who would not have passed the SAT, as we know the

SAT today. Many were poor readers, some had not completed the eighth grade, but they were admitted to Michigan State and put through a special educational training program that qualified them for "normal college studies" as it was referred at that time. Many did complete the regular university curriculum and graduate. After World War II, when the GI Bill made it possible for many young men to attend college, we found that universities dramatically and readily modified their standards to accept young people. When World War II ended, Michigan State University's undergraduate enrollment was roughly between 14,000 and 15,000. Over the next ten years, that enrollment went up to 25,000 or 26,000 and has reached 44,000 today. During that period of time, we took into the university men who were suffering from many of the disadvantages that we refer to today when we associate disadvantage with minority youth.

I can recall in reading about the history of Michigan State University at that time that President John Hannah gave a "C" dinner. Now we give an "A" dinner at Michigan University. An "A" dinner is for all students who compile a 4.0 average in the prior semester and they are honored at a dinner for obtaining all "A's." A "C" dinner was given at that time to motivate young men to remain in school and to complete their education. During that period of time, even though the undergraduate enrollment at Michigan State was substantial, and as late as 1950, when I enrolled in the Ph.D. program at Michigan State University, we only had 100 black students, no native American students, and no Spanish speaking students. From 60 to 65 per cent of the 100 black students were on athletic scholarships. I can recall when I was at San Francisco State as an undergraduate student, I watched Michigan State University play Notre Dame in a football game. I looked at those blacks on the football team and I said, "that's where I'm going to get my Ph.D., because they've got a large black student body population, and I won't be racially isolated." I had a rude shock when I arrived at Michigan State. I had to go out to the football field to find the blacks.

The second comment that Dr. Epps made, which I agree with fully, is the ability of professors to become human. Humanity sometimes escapes us within the university community. The approachable professor is important. The approachable professor idea, as conceived and offered to us today by Dr. Epps, is something I would like to reflect on for a moment. All of us are very much aware of the research of Rosenthal and Jacobson regarding teacher attitude, pupil behavior, and self-fulfilling prophecies. Even though the research designed paradigm they used has been criticized, I think the general notion is pretty much accepted that we shape and modify the behavior of others by how we treat them. How we react and respond to young people is very much a function of how they, in turn, respond to what is offered to them. This became very clear to me in a major school desegregation case that I testified in about

seven years ago. In one school district in a particular city, in a state not too far away, we were able to obtain data on the graduating class of June, 1970. We went back 12 years to look at the relationship between educational tracking and academic achievement. A group of parents of black and Spanish speaking children sued the school district, arguing that educational programs in racially isolated black and Spanish-speaking schools were inferior to the schools in the white community. What we did was to look at three measures: (1) measures of achievement, (2) the criteria utilized to place young people in certain programs and, finally, (3) academic achievement over the 12 year period. We found that in this school district a youngster's performance on a test at the second grade level was the basis on which he or she was tracked. Most of you know quite a bit about tests, I would imagine. Being an old school psychologist myself, I know very well that the predictive validity of tests is not high, especially when you administer the test to a seven or an eight year old child. A bad cold, a poor direction, or a host of factors might account for low test scores. Also many of the instruments, due to the arrangement of an item, are very sensitive to score changes at the lower level. Take the California Achievement Test, for example. At the third or fourth grade level, a youngster passing or failing one or two items might elevate or depress his/her score by a whole grade level.

Youngsters were placed across 12 different levels based upon their performance on a standardized achievement test. Tracked over 12 different levels, children were locked in. Once youngsters were placed in any particular track, they never got out of that track. They either graduated in a high track or they dropped out of school from one of the low tracks. Secondly, we found that there was a relationship between track placement and the curriculum that was offered to the child. Children in the low tracks were offered a very inferior curriculum. It became very obvious to those of us who looked at the data, that if those youngsters were not retarded when they entered into those tracks as second and third graders, remaining in an inferior curriculum for eight to twelve years would produce a level of dysfunctional educational behavior. Moreover, we were able to relate that placement to teacher attitude, and at the public school level, we did have inservice training programs for teachers.

Unfortunately, professors at the university level resist inservice training. And professors believe that minority children, the children of the poor, are dysfunctional youngsters. I have had experiences at my own university and at universities throughout the country, where many university professors, as the minority enrollment increased, perceived that the youngster was at an educational disadvantage. Perhaps he could not read, or perhaps he attended a high school that was inferior in a science. These are the kinds of notions that are very often structured without adequate data.

It has been my experience in the years that I have been in higher education that standardized achievement and aptitude test scores are the worse predictors of how a youngster will perform in an academic program. The best single predictor is past academic performance. If a youngster performs well at the high school level at a decent high school, and the SAT scores are relatively low but his grades are high, I would be much more willing to take a chance on that youngster, than on one who graduates from high school with a very poor record academically but has relatively high SAT verbal and math scores. We found at Michigan State University at the Ph.D. level, that the graduate record exam and the Miller analogy were very poor predictors of how young people were going to perform in a graduate program. I can remember when I took the Miller analogy over at Berkeley when I was a second year master's student at San Francisco State. I believe that the first item went something like this: Bach is to Beethoven as the square root of minus one is to A, B, C, D, and E. Now I had had two years of college math and I probably could have handled the relationship between the square root of minus one and the distractors that were in the item. But I know nothing about the relationship between Bach and Beethoven. If the question had been phrased like this: Sister Rosetta Thorpe is to the Five Blind Boys of Alabama as the square root of minus one is to A, B, C, D, and E, I probably would have gotten that item right.

Finally, the whole question of lowering standards is a code term for minority students at the university level. I never use the term, lowering standards. I talk about modifying or expanding standards. You can expand standards and you can modify standards in order to admit young people and then provide them with an opportunity to succeed. Finally, the mastery motivational model of Epps is a very excellent one, one I support fully. I adhere to the notion that exit standards are important. You may modify and expand standards to admit students, but once they are in we have an obligation to see them through. And there is nothing magical about graduating in four years. At Michigan State University, the average graduation time is 4.4 years, so we need not rush to push young people out in four years. I say this to my students, "If you need an additional 6 months, if you need an additional term, if you need an additional year, it is better to remain in the university program for an additional year, and leave with solid skills."

Robert Worthington, Chairman and Senior Research Associate, Career Development Associates, Inc., former Associate Commissioner of Education USA

The review of the literature concerning post secondary students with learning deficiencies reveals that two conceptual frameworks dominate the thinking of various writers. In one conceptual framework, emphasis is placed on disadvantagement of the students. In the other, emphasis is placed on the differences among students, whether racial, economic, or sociological. It is emphasized over and over again that academically deficient students, who were under conceptual framework I, have one or more of the following disadvantages. The first of these disadvantages is poor academic preparation in high school. This refers to the high school's failure to provide adequate college preparatory education which results in the students' generally lower achievements in their high school studies. Lower standards, less competition, and other factors combine to make these students deficient in verbal skills, reading, writing, standard English expression, math, foreign languages, and sciences. The second disadvantage is poor attention to intellectual inquiry, poor study habits, and weak learning skills produced in students less capable of dealing adequately with post-secondary subject matter. The third disadvantage, predictable social psychological problems such as adjustment to a post-secondary atmosphere, result in the lack of long-term expectations of further education beyond high school and of less sophisticated preparation for campus life. Other social and psychological factors include less personal and family support, greater bewilderment, isolation from other new students in their environment, and a limited experience background. A fourth disadvantage revolves around personal problems resulting from lack of motivation, poor self concept, low personal aspirations and expectations, low income background, and the continuing effects of poverty during a student's residence in a post-secondary institution.

✓ Within this conceptual framework of disadvantagements, emphasis is placed on compensatory or remedial programs. The student is often viewed from an institutional standpoint, rather than as an individual. The main consideration is to determine how, despite disadvantagement, the student can measure up to traditional established standards. Thus, special admission procedures, reduced course loads, financial aid, special academic counseling, tutoring, and so forth have been employed to bring the students to an acceptable level. Many of these procedures are necessary and usually beneficial, but they often create or enhance feelings of inferiority and dependency on the part of the students. They often cause an attitude on the part of the counselors and instructors that failure must be prevented at any cost. This may result in the lowering of

standards, making assumptions of student inferiority, underestimating a student's ability, and directing the students to take the paths of least resistance by electing easy courses simply for the sake of passing.

In the second conceptual framework appearing in the literature, the academically deficient student is often a person from a minority group or a rural or urban poor group, and is usually described in terms of differences in origin. In many respects, these students are placed in an environment which is new to them. The majority of the people with whom they come in contact do not share their values, their concerns, or their thinking. They often are ignored or receive hostile treatment. They are admitted, taught, advised, and measured according to standards and viewpoints which are, more or less, irrelevant to their backgrounds. About this conceptual framework, Gilbert Maddix, Director of Special Academic Projects, University of Michigan, states: "For the black student who is academically deficient, emphasis should be placed on personal, social and academic programs which relate to the black experience, needs and goals." He continues, "Successful programs should concentrate not only on personal and academic growth, but on preparation for leadership and on building up the black community in America as well."

Rosemary Hake, Associate Professor of English, Chicago State University

I must begin by indicating that at Chicago State University we did not really consider ourselves starting out on a remedial program. We were doing what universities tend to do and that was trying to research what we did not know. One of the things we did not know was what kind of skills are in entering students' heads, and what kind of skills we are going to demand they have before we let them go. We operate, I think, quite honestly, on the educational principle that we can influence and, indeed, change behavior. Our teaching, particularly at the composition level, at CSU is based theoretically on the empirical research model. We try to indicate what a student's skills are at entering level; we try to propose some kind of training for whatever we have ascertained as skill level; then we test to find out whether or not the student has the skill level that we claim is the adequate skill level, in writing, for somebody who is operating at a university level. Our teaching fits this experimental model. We operate, I would suppose, in an age of accountability where testing is the key word in research. Pre and post testing. What are students like when you get them, what are they like when you finish, are they adequately prepared? The first distinction in that kind of testing is for the teacher to decide what it is he does claim to do and then he has to

test if whether or not what he claims he is doing is what society wants done. I think that we have to begin to identify as teachers that we are not only teachers, but testers. I think the problem in teaching right now is that we have allowed too many people outside to test what we are doing inside. We do not ever know what is going on. It is really unfortunate that teachers and testers do not see themselves as researchers who face different sides of the same problem, specifying how to observe performance of a latent ability and finding a mathematical formulation to characterize those observations. Teachers should recognize that the methodological principles are not a necessary level of empirical research, but the only means we have to identify what it is we propose to teach and to explain and illustrate whether or not we have taught it. If testers would appreciate how teachers' metaphors relate to what their models of competence are, then we could help solve our problems.

Now though, as I am speaking to you, I will assume the theoretical role of the researcher to make these points. First, an evaluating instrument not only controls how one illustrates and explains facts, but limits the facts one can perceive. Secondly, the processes of teaching and evaluating should function as both a cause and effect of one another. I choose to emphasize the pragmatic role of the teacher because it is, I think, time that teachers should direct some of the research and evaluate it.

Teachers have been plagued by the testing problem for years. We intuitively know that measurement units should serve evaluation, but we do not know how. By measurement unit, I mean things like age, height, and weight. I can state to you that I am forty years old, I weight 118 lbs., and I am about 5'5" tall. Now if I want to apply that to an evaluation, I can go and apply to become an airline stewardess, and I might be over supplying as a matter of fact. I might make it in height and weight, but I am too old. I know I should not bother applying next year, in case the population changes, because next year I am going to be forty-one, and their age parameter is thirty-five. I do not have to argue with them and try to figure out what is going on. If you compare those units of measurement with the kind of units we have in our standardized tests in education, I think you can see the differences. Ever since I was old enough to argue with my classmates over who had the best IQ, and I say best because I thought a 100 was perfect and 60 was passing, I was trying to figure out what those numbers meant; they were ambiguous. I could take a test and I would find out that I was smart or that the test was easy. But, what I usually found out was that I hoped for an easy test so I could look smart.

Later, when I got into teaching, I was even more puzzled when I learned that a test score gives a relative measure of ability. I had actual situations like this. I would have students who would enter at 64 percentile, and they would exit at a 55 percentile, even though they answered more

questions. Now that student was not being judged by the test he took; he was being judged by the company he kept. There was no cumulative measurement. I was trying to measure his ability with a rubber ruler. The critical issue with a framework like that was that it was impossible for me to ask my important question. How much writing did I teach him? How much did he learn? He scored lower but he answered more. That is non-sensical talk. I was bothered. You can see why English teachers have "pooh poohed" those objective tests that purport to measure writing but measure whether A, B, or C agrees with the guy in Princeton, New Jersey. I was actually bothered when I had to submit my students' written performances to a rater's evaluation. The judges' responses were not like calibrated scales which gave consistent weight judgments. In some cases, I had never heard of the units they were using and in others, I did not know how they were weighing the units. I have always been suspicious of people's ratings because I did not know what they were doing.

I think I developed the suspicion or the suspicious nature when I had decided to get into this testing business about seventeen years ago when I was teaching high school. I was teaching sophomore level high school. I was particularly naive then. We decided in the Chicago school system that all fifteen year olds should read *Silas Marner*. I, local dummy, went to the meeting and asked why. I was told we were going to read *Silas Marner* because it was structurally a fine novel. I agreed, it is a structurally fine novel. I went back to my fifteen year olds with *Silas* under one arm and my intentions under the other and proceeded to teach the structure. I said now we were going to read *Silas*, and we were going to compare and contrast. We were going to see how he was at the beginning, and then we were going to see how he was different at the end. We were studying a comparison, a contrast, cause and effect. They did not have to like *Silas*; they did not have to like *Dunston*; they did not have to like anybody. They had to see how the character changed. They had to see cause and effect. They had to relate it to sub-plot by seeing how other characters changed. I then proposed to the committee, with the same simplicity, that on the test on the structure of the novel, we allow the student to read any novel he wanted and explain to us how his novel fit the structure we said we were teaching. It was at this time I was introduced to the term standardized test norm. I was told we needed standardized tests to make our findings reliable and valid and that we would write our essay questions and would rate the students' answers. The first question, on the standardized test for the novel of which we were teaching the structure was, "What was Eppy's real name?" You know how much that had to do with structure. But better yet, the structure essay question that we were writing to find out whether or not the student knew the structure of the novel was, "Is *Silas Marner* a good

book? If so, why so? If not, why not?" Now I have to tell you a true answer. I had a boy in my class who answered that essay question. "I think a good book has a lot of fucking and gun fights. Silas Marner ain't got no fucking and no gun fights. Silas Marner ain't a good book." I gave him an "A." I did not agree with his definition of a good book, nor did I think he even wrote an essay. But, I could not argue with his impeccable logic: $GB = F$ and GF : SM does not equal F and GF , therefore SM does not equal GB . My colleagues failed him because he did not answer *our* question. You know that was right. Alfred had answered the *test* question. *Our* question was, "Tell us what we told you a good book is. Tell us how Silas Marner fits what we told you a good book is." I found out that in no way was what we were testing reflecting what we claimed we were teaching, and it has been repeated throughout my academic career.

Being an English teacher and interested in that essay question, I was relieved with Noah Chomsky's linguistic revolution, when he made me see a distinction between competence, (that is, all that is possible; what in psychometric testing theory is called latent trait) and performance (that is, something which is possible and which Chomsky calls surface performance). I became aware that performance may not reflect competence, but as a teacher, performance is all I have to work with and I have to assume that the performance I am looking at is in some way measuring an ability. I then took upon myself the job of devising some kind of essay test, because the performance I wanted to observe was that of writing an essay. Could the student's essay fit the Aristotelian model of introduction, body, and conclusion? Could he fill it in with the parts it was supposed to have? Did he have logical connection among his statements; did he operate with standard usage; could he punctuate? What I developed was an observation framework that would guide people who were grading an essay so we could get specific recommendations.

This is the framework that we work with at Chicago State. We have every entering student take the essay exam. We then have it graded using the observation framework of dimension one, the finite structure of the essay. The functioning characteristics are dimension two, mechanics and meaning; dimension three, usage; dimension four, punctuation. We have the observer mark. The next problem that comes up is the differences among graders. It does not take students too long to figure out whom they want to get. We developed a way. It is Rasch's statistical model. We have developed a way of collapsing a measurement so that as we get ten observations on the same frame, we can collapse the measurement to numbers which are like pounds, which are like years, which are like times. The student will have a number in terms of flawed performance, regardless of who make the judgment. I tried to develop a way of looking at the essay that deals with structure, not substance. I did not feel that I was judging what the student wrote, or that we

at Chicago State wanted to judge what he wrote, but how he wrote. So we deal with substance. We can then collapse this judgement so that when the student enters he gets a certain score; based on his score, he is placed in a certain teaching module.

Now, I have heard discussed the concept of giving credit. At Chicago State, a student must have six in composition. As the student enters and is given the student diagnostic exam, he is placed in a teaching module of Composition I, and must pass at the exit level the same kind of test to go on to Composition II, heterogeneously grouped. It takes some students two terms to get through Composition I and II; it takes some students five, six and seven terms to get through, but they do get through. They get through because we have evidence. We can say to the student, "Well, you did not have the pass level of a score of 012, which means missing no parts of the essay and having only twelve mistakes on four pages of writing completed in an hour. We have a student who at his first exit performance may score 219, not a passing level, and he is re-cycled into another structured teaching module. But, we are able to say to the student, "Yes, it is still not a competent passing level, but your entering score was 539, five missing parts of the essay and 39 mistakes. Your score after the first term is 219." Students stay with us for that reason. They can see their progress. We have developed our system in such a way that we can identify. We teach it, operating on the assumption that the whole generates parts. We teach to dimension I first, if that is the student's problem, or we teach to dimension III. We do not give the student drills in usage if meaning connections is his problem. We do not drill on "go and goes" until "go and goes" is the problem up the line. We find that some of our students will jump at parallel levels. We operate, I think, on this research methodology. We know what we are going, and teach to the test. That is a bad word in many places, but we do it. We have been able to research different methodologies. If we have a particular problem, some of our teachers will say, "I'm going to develop something for this and will teach to that." We have the evidence of starting skills and exit skills. We have ways of testing methodology, on the methodological principle of pre-post measurement of a definition in terms of skill level of what the student's problem is. We feel some comfort, because the student does feel he is making some progress, even though he is dreadfully mad at me the first and second time around.

Having presented this report on what I take to be distinctive features in the examining procedures which direct our research teaching, I must hasten to add that it is preliminary information. However, I must state that at Chicago State we have found distinct advantages in researching with and teaching to our test. First, it provides detailed feedback easily understandable to the individual whose performance is being judged. Secondly, it can diagnose student's specific weaknesses, so that we can

develop a teaching system for him. Thirdly, it generates data about the student which we can use for future research. Fourthly, it does not impose an arbitrary set of outside standards on the grader; it lets the grader operate as he will. I assume that people are different and having gone to seventeen years of grader meetings where we fought so that we would all be alike, I just decided if people are different, I should let them be different and then account for their differences. It does not impose an arbitrary set of outside standards on the grader. I makes the grader's particular observations and judgments central to the process of measuring and evaluating. It allows the development of a consensus standard based on the practical working judgment of those making the judgment. As you can see, we have operated on Ben Bloom's mastery of learning theory before we knew he had formulated it. We continually teach to our objective. The student is to write clear, correct informational prose, a paper that is coherent, united, organized, and free from serious mechanical error. In other words, as we cycle the student through the various composition modules, we may change the way we teach him, but we do not change what we teach. Our remedial work, which it is now called, has given us the opportunity to apply some solid research and to find out what we did not know. We are still finding out what it is we have to find out. What we at Chicago State hope to start is some on-the-line research; we would like to help teachers categorize the performances they want to observe as they try to elicit a competence they claim exists.

Manford Byrd, Jr., Deputy Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools

This conference is worthwhile and though I speak from the perspective of a large urban public school system, I am certain that no matter where you are from, as you talk to the public people, some of my sentiments will be shared by them. Our goal in public education is to reduce the number of young people who need remediation both in our institutions and in yours.

The Chicago public schools are concerned about a developmental program that will hopefully result in fewer remedial tasks for us and for you. First off, it is our intent, with the supply of teachers that we have in the market place, to do a better job of selection. I have talked with our examining department, it is called the Board of Examiners, before coming over to this session, and I was assured that over the last year we have doubled the requirements in the teaching of reading and in the teaching of arithmetic for incoming elementary teachers. I was told that the requirements for instruction in teaching of reading for English teachers have also increased.

I think we must put great stake in the curriculum that we offer and how

we deal with the staff once the staff is on board. Some of these terms may be esoteric, but let me try to give you a flavor for them. In curriculum over the last three or four years, we have worked very intensively in developing a continuous progress learning program. The intent is to develop a strategy in the reading process so that these reading skills can be identified, and a teacher can determine when youngsters have mastered them and are ready to move along. There is a monitoring system that goes along with this. It is the intent of the scheme to devise a method of plotting the skill development of students and of determining whether or not they have achieved the level that we desire within the time frame prescribed, and if they have not, to devise a program of remediation.

Another program that is alive and well in the schools is known to us as the Intensive Reading Improvement Program. The program came about because it was our feeling, long ago, that we needed in every elementary school an advocate for the teaching of reading. The advocate would get in and work with teachers, so that they were effective with youngsters when teaching reading. Recently, our Board of Education approved a policy of developing a proficiency skills test. Attached to this procedure will be end-of-cycle-testing at the elementary level. That means that at the end of the primary cycle, at the end of the intermediate, and at the end of the upper cycle, youngsters will be tested to see that skills have been mastered before moving along. At the high school level we have established reading and mathematics laboratories at every school. These labs have been programmed for a double period of English, so that the reading skill can be more aggressively attacked. Also, we are very much interested in programs at the pre-school or pre-kindergarten level. We continue to put emphasis on the child-parent centers and other early child programs.

Our school system provides for five half days each year for in-service training of teachers either at the local school, the district level, or the city-wide level. The board and the state code provide this time so that teachers can work on development of their subject areas to determine ways they can be more effective with their students as well as more successful with them. To help in this area we have a special Bureau of Reading Improvement in the schools. This Bureau works with district reading coordinators to try to develop an effective program of reading instruction. That is what we are doing internally with our staff because we know that the goal we seek is effective teaching.

Additionally, we are working with other agencies to try to understand and motivate students. One program we are working with is the Association of Commerce and Industry program called Youth Motivation. It is in operation in some thirty-four of our sixty high schools. In essence, the program involves businesses of Chicago who provide a chairman for

each of these schools. That chairman recruits successful business persons from the same background as the students to serve and assist the counselors in the schools in developing career conferences, providing tours for students, and exposing students to the world of work and different careers. This is done in an effort to let students know what is needed to become successful in various careers, with the hope that they will be motivated to tackle the subjects and become better at them.

Also, we are working with Operation Push in a program called "Push for Excellence." We have some eleven high schools that are working on the theory that the students, the teachers, the administrators, and the parents can come together in a meaningful alliance and can become more successful as an instrument for helping youngsters learn, than the school can by itself. Principals in the Push for Excellence schools feel that there is hope; that students who take on a greater responsibility for their learning, assisted by parents and by teachers, will be assured by the community that learning is worthwhile. This will give us dividends in the end.

Lenore Dyxin, President of Chicago's Regional PTA

For many years professional educators sold parents on the hand-off theory of schooling. When questions were asked, educators smiled knowingly and told concerned parents to relax and leave things to the professional saying, "We know what's best for your child." Well, as a consequence, it is estimated that many Americans can not do basic figuring, compute car gasoline mileage, or count change received from a purchase. In reading, it was the same thing, inability to fill out job applications or even read simple directions on assembling an item. Many parents are reluctant to consult principals and teachers, the "forbidding authority figures," so well remembered from their own childhood. Yet, this is probably what they should do; confront them and demand to know why their child is unable to read or write. The non-English speaking parent can be literally frightened at the prospect of facing the teacher without knowing how to convey her feelings.

Many parents are thoroughly confused about why teachers continue to pass students who can not read, write, or do simple arithmetic. The following is an excerpt from a letter sent to a Kansas City newspaper:

Some recent inquiry has developed the astounding information that in our school system a child need not become proficient in one grade before he or she is passed on to the next one; in other words, everyone passes. I understand that this practice of just moving children through the grades year after year without any qualifying ability being required or tested at any level has been enforced for some fifteen years.

This letter was written after the writer, a businessperson, found job applicants with high school diplomas unable to pass the simplest part of their pre-employment test. Many parents think once their child graduates from high school, he or she will be able to get a job. They do not know that the lack of ability to read or write prevents that student from obtaining employment, not laziness. Most parents do not realize this until it is too late. They have not involved themselves in the curriculum of the schools. Parents who do take an interest often insist on courses that prepare the student for college without knowing whether or not the student is capable. They realize too late that the student can not pass the entrance exam or finds college too much of a hassle and drops out. Some parents are finally becoming aware that the student did not want to go to college in the first place, but was talked into it by parents or peers.

Requirements for graduation permit almost no flexibility to take career courses plus college preparatory. There are some students lucky enough to graduate with a typing credit or two, which gives them a head start. (Chicago schools have the four majors rule.) There is no time for business or other career-type courses. For the past two years, a curriculum committee, including students, has been trying to change the requirements for graduation by cutting to three credits of English and two credits of social studies. Not all committee members have been convinced that it is needed. Some committee members believe that a three or four year sequence of vocational career education should be required of every student before graduation. An on-going controversy in Chicago is whether or not counselors are effective in the high schools. The PTA feels it should be compulsory for parents to meet with counselors during the student's first year in the high school to help plan his/her future education.

Albert Berrian, Vice President, Institute for Services to Education

With your indulgence, I shall approach the subject of evaluation obliquely, and finally enter into it within the context of planning and management. First, I would like to speculate a bit on how we became faced with the dilemma that brings us here. How have college and university officials and practitioners come to entertain the idea that under-socialized and under-prepared masses are educable over the short range? Can deficits caused by cultural socio-economic circumstances be made up on a crash basis? No, it is not so much that educators and those who influence their activities have gone mad, but rather that harsh and crisis provoking economic realities have brought them face to face with a new kind of necessity.

A cursory examination of national manpower trends, even over a three

year period, will reveal dramatic declines in the blue collar and farm work forces. There are less than two million farm workers left in this country. It is not accident that the political power of workers' unions has been blunted. There just are not that many blue collar workers left among us. The number of jobs available, incidentally, increases each year. But the majority of these jobs require academic, problem solving, and managerial skills beyond the grasp of large numbers of youths, older workers, minorities, and others facing structural unemployment. One does not have to be overly imaginative to draw conclusions about the strain that this situation places on an economy beset by chronically slow growth and unemployment. In short, our country, if it is to maintain a place of eminence among the society of nations, is faced with a necessity of maximizing the productive capacity of this total pool of human resources.

This can not be done without an educational delivery system, the effectiveness of which is guaranteed by expert planning and the proper management of the processes and procedures that will undergird that system. Evaluation, then, represents a simple tool for tightening up the plan and for balancing processes and procedures off against project goals. It is fortunate for educators that human beings have vast intelligence and stores and stores of under-utilized psychic energy. This condition exists in equal proportions across ethnic and socio-economic lines, so that the masses, properly energized and intellectually channeled, are capable of quantum intellectual leaps. All that is needed are educators who have an understanding of the national crisis, who have a commitment to the cause of resolving this crisis, and a commitment to providing the leadership, management, and technical support required to maximize human potential. There is no question that colleges and universities must solve this problem because colleges and universities are where the brains are.

But, then, let us get on with the question of evaluation. Since formative evaluation largely has to do with process and summative evaluation has largely to do with end products, let me use these two notions, that of process and that of end products, to give you feeling for how the Institute for Services to Education deals with the question of evaluation. We approach curriculum evaluation in two ways, consortium arrangements and bilateral arrangements. In the former, student questionnaires are used on a yearly basis to determine whether teachers follow the needs-based instructional approaches to which they commit themselves. This takes place in the evaluation of eight academic disciplines. It is interesting, but very seldom have I heard the word students mentioned here, and at no time, if I remember correctly, has anyone said anything about what the students feel about what we are doing to them and for them, and what we are planning for them. So we take a student centered approach rather

than a faculty centered approach to this problem. We try to ascertain whether, in the opinion of students, the approaches used by the teachers and the course content are relevant and beneficial.

In the second method, we deal with institutions on a face-to-face basis or a bilateral arrangement. Members of the school, faculty and/or administration, are asked to define the programmatic and instructional needs that they feel are peculiar to their own situation. Then we attempt to help these institutions individually to determine whether they have made an accurate needs assessment, and whether the strategies that they have mounted to meet these needs are getting effective results. ISE's approach, as you can see, is purely developmental in that it centers around helping institutions collectively or individually get their faculties and administrators to interact in such a way as to mount processes suitable to their own programmatic situations. Next, we help them determine whether or not the goals and objectives are, in their and their students' perceptions, being met.

Over a period of time, my organization has moved from faculty and curriculum development to the packaging of a total educational delivery system. This has been accomplished by setting up a three divisional structure based on: faculty and curriculum development; planning and management with components in academic planning, management information systems and institutional research; and research and evaluation. The work of these three divisions is coordinated through an executive council that meets on a weekly basis, and the development of problem solving ad hoc teams that are put together to assess and serve felt institutional needs both within the consortium and outside.

How does this work in real world terms? One of the public developing institutions that we serve has asked us to help them pull together nineteen funded projects in innovative teaching in order that these projects impact on the quality of instruction across programs and disciplines. Our chief academic planner was sent in, and I joined his team to determine what the institution's stated mission was and to make certain that tentative project goals and objectives were consonant with the institutional mission and its stated programmatic goals and objective. The academic planner worked with members of the key decision making bodies in that institution, and with divisional and departmental chairmen through the chief academic offices. The group then helped the teaching faculty to arrive at definitions of what they understood about innovative teaching. The purpose of the grant was to do innovative teaching and make teaching more effective. As it turned out, innovative teaching within the context of this institution's plan had to do with a student-centered approach to education.

Since the students in question came mainly from lower socio-economic circumstances and tended to be pragmatic in their outlook and in

their behavior patterns, innovation took the form of experientially based interactive modes of teaching and learning. The theory underlying this was that this mode acts as a bridge to more passive and theoretical modes of teaching and learning. Problem solving skills, rather than skills in understanding theories and developing theoretical models, were the ones that were selected to be taught first. Secondly, the verbal skills of these students were roughly at an eighth grade level, as measured by standardized tests, so that the teachers across disciplines decided to pay special attention to student written expression. The project coordinator was advised to have an expert in evaluation attached to this team, so that the head of each discrete project, and later the group as a whole, would get in-service training in evaluation design and procedures. This was done.

ISE's present role in all of this comes down to our making an external evaluation of the project. Two of us, our chief academic planner and myself, visit with the coordinator and with the internal evaluator and with the individual project directors periodically, in an effort to determine whether agreed upon teaching-learning strategies are adhered to; whether administrative commitment is constant; and whether projected programmatic objectives are being met. Our evaluation efforts are carried out within a developmental context and have both formative and summative characteristics.

Edmund Gordon, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

I consider that the primary differences between formative and summative research evaluation have to do with the point at which they enter and the point at which they are used. Those of us who are primarily concerned with formative processes, as Dr. Berrian has indicated, are interested in the process by which the program phenomenon moves. It is not just process that we are interested in. We are primarily interested in forming the process, providing input in that process, and improving that process. It is formative in the sense that it is developmental as opposed to summative, in the sense that we are now looking at the outcomes of it; we are looking at the program after the fact. The quality of that evaluative research needs to be much the same whether one is talking about formative or summative evaluation. However, since formative evaluation does put this very much in the middle of the action, and I think some of the evaluators ought to be there also, one can not possibly do formative evaluation without being in the process, a participant observer, very much a part of what is going on. This further complicates the process; it makes it much more difficult.

One source talks about the problems of research. He was talking about field evaluation primarily, as a summative process, and how difficult it was. I am simply suggesting that when we move in on the process—so as to study that process, to even be a part of that process, to change it, to shape it—we have an even more difficult task. Those of us who have primary responsibility for program, interacting with those of us who have primary responsibility for evaluation, need to be sensitive to the needs, the concerns, and the problems that we create for each other. As we move in to study a program, the mere fact that we are there makes the program different. As you try to protect the interests of students, the assumption is that the need to remember that those of us who are trying to evaluate it are also trying to protect the interests of those students. The assumption is that the greatest protection that we can provide, for both student and program, is to better understand them.

Now, I want to quote from the conference program, "for many years institutions of higher learning have served students with learning deficiencies through programs with such titles as Developmental Studies, Skill Development, Remedial Education, Compensatory Education." Those of us involved in such programs have been invited to come together here in Chicago to discuss this work. Dr. Berrian and I have been asked to talk about formative and summative evaluation of such programs. The call to this meeting and its title reflect one of the essential problems which limits effective evaluation. Under these several titles, a wide variety of programs, non-programs, and activities are sponsored. When we turn to the evaluation literature, those titles and still others are encountered and treated as if they were, in reality, an accurate indicator of what is being delivered to students. The problem is that these program labels are poor informants of what programs really are. Even those reports which give some descriptive treatment of programs usually provide so little detail that the reader is left uninformed with respect to what has actually been delivered.

I wish that I could say that it is only a problem that the details are not reported. After studying the programs of this sort, for several years, I must also indicate that in far too many instances, even on-sight inspection reveals programs that are nebulous, poorly conceived, weakly developed, and sometimes non-existent. If you want to read fiction, come to some of the funding offices and see what people say they are doing, and then go out and look at it. Yet, we see a considerable amount of concern with evaluation, seldom with the program, but usually with student outcomes. We look at post-treatment, post-test scores, and grade point averages and we sometimes see significant gains, but we often see no effects. Now after almost twenty years of considerable activity and a great deal of evaluation data on these programs, we have to conclude that of that data, the findings or conclusions are confused and confusing.

I commend the distinguished colleagues who are here for addressing the issue. That in itself is the first step to any kind of solution. I would also say that I know I am talking to many, many people who started as school teachers at a time when, if you were a kindergarten teacher, you said, "what is the matter with the family? I get these kids and they are not ready." If you were a first grade teacher you said, "what is the matter with the kindergarten teacher?" When you get up all the way through the grades it is usually that way. So it is not really a misunderstanding to find out that we have got some concerns when we get to college. Especially, I think, when you stop and realize we are talking about a whole generation of students reflecting the agonizing fifties and the getting your feet upon "beach head," so to speak, of the sixties and in terms reflecting an educational system that was going to be open universally to every child in America.

I think we are focusing now, perhaps, on quality and I think this is a very positive thing. Therefore remediation, perhaps, is only a negative or reparative type of setting when you spend more time on repair than you do on the quality or the viability of the program.

I am trying to start in a way that I think is probably more positive than negative. I think we are addressing the problem, and therefore, I think that we are also talking about the sense in which remediation, like so many words in our society, takes on "red flag" types of connotations. What we should be talking about is not just the sense of remediation, as such but the area of life-long kinds of educational needs, the infectious kinds of needs that should be reflected throughout our programs from pre-school on. The other thing that we are constantly talking about is the need for remediation, if that's the word, for our students.

The greatest problem we have right now in education is the need for staff development to bring people up to the speed of an on-going type of program, so that we know that we have got the professionals that can, in fact, carry out some of the responsibilities. Business and industry for years have spent great sums of money training their professionals and executives and by so doing have a viability within the organizations. We have not been able to spend those kinds of dollars, especially in public education. It is a very unfair climate that many of our professionals are put into. It is unfair because when they leave school or graduate from school their opportunity for growth is very minimal. I think the seventies are going to reflect something from which we are going to get far greater production. We are going to make some demands, and I think it is interesting that we are talking about making demands because it was not too long ago that we heard demands coming from the other side toward

educators and certainly toward the administrators. "Demands" might be a little harsh, but, if translated, what they mean is that we are expecting to get quality. We are expecting the teachers and others who are responsible for education realize just as early as possible, that every child does have the innate ability to learn, and that some of the self-fulfilling prophecies are going to have to be discarded. In certain areas of the cities, especially, the consideration is that kids come from a certain socio-economic background, and therefore not too much is to be expected from them. I think this is something that we have to work at very, very assiduously to correct. It is not that I am standing here saying that I have the answers. In a sense, it is saying that there is a shared responsibility.

The shared responsibility is another thing that I think we are seeing in the seventies that we did not see in the past ten or fifteen years. It is something that we were reflecting; some of the aspects of the so-called Pled Piper of Panacea—the Spocks, for example, who told the whole world that you really did not need so much work ethic, that what you needed was to be very, very loving to your children and so on. I know that I am making this very, very simple, in terms of what Dr. Spock said, but we have whole generations of children who really have never assimilated the fact that if they are going to be successful, they are going to have to work darn hard to be successful. I think that there has been a whole generation of kids and parents who thought that if they lived in a lovely classroom for twelve years, carpeted, air conditioned, and so forth, and did what they were supposed to be doing, that there would be a success syndrome out there. It isn't there. It never was for us and it is not going to be for these kids. I think this is being realized. Therefore, I see this as being positive.

We are talking very definitely in the area of standards, and I think we should go back to standards. It was not too long ago that a "C" was an average grade. If a kid comes from college now with less than a "B," somehow he is a failure. So, we are going to have to take a look at the standards throughout the entire system.

I think we are talking about a shared responsibility in our society, and I think this is a very critical one. I am saying that there is a need shared between the educator and the client. I think there is another consideration, and that is people. Economists such as Peter Drucker talk about our moving into a modern age, but yet an unknown kind of age. What is the new age that we are in at present? What we are talking about is reflecting on a so-called growthmanship, so that we have a whole generation of individuals who have been part of a success syndrome. I am talking economically. Money has to do far more things, now, in an era of retrenchment with diminishing resources and with the far greater needs that our kids have.

We are reflecting in the cities, especially new cities, and I think that the new cities are going to demand new kinds of educational tools, new kinds of responsibility. I might say something else about the cities. I am one of those guys who has a love affair with the cities and I think that what has been done in the last ten years by the administration that was in Washington, was to almost destroy the cities of this country. Most of us who live in the cities feel fondly about them. They have their faults, and we are not where we should be with them, but, traditionally, they have been the matrix of commerce, industry, finance, government, the arts, education, research, and major health services. They are all on the decline, but hopefully, the cities are going to take on a new aspect as we go into the next era of this administration.

The Reverend Jesse Jackson, President - Operation PUSH

Many of the problems that we confront in public education today, lower and higher education, are seen as ethnic—Black, or Chicano, or Latin, or Polish, or some other ethnic group. I contend that there is fundamentally an ethical crisis. The reason black children and brown children and poor children can not read has little to do with their ethnicity. It has much to do with their activities. The problem is not so much a lack of genes, as a lack of an agenda. The fundamental crisis is more ethics than ethnicity. So we raised the proposition for a PUSH for Excellence. What do we mean by "Excellence?" Excellence is a quality of spirit. Excellence reflects taste and values and it must not be seen as punishment to poor people. Excellence is an attainable goal. All of us must struggle to achieve the best that we can achieve that will raise us above our environment and our circumstances. We must move beyond competing with others who give up and fall out. We must begin to mature and compete with ourselves and become the best that we can become. By doing this, we will be approximating excellence. If it were true that fighting for the doors of opportunity to be opened was a revolutionary gesture, if having opportunity was the result of revolutionary gesture—the hangings, the lynchings, the mobbings, the marchings, the jailings, the assassinations, if the struggle to open the doors of opportunity was a revolutionary gesture, then taking advantage of those opportunities must be seen as the next step in the revolution. Not to take advantage of those open doors must be seen as a counter revolutionary gesture.

The priority in education must not be the pursuit of educational existence, but the pursuit of educational excellence. It seems to me that there is nothing more demeaning than to go on some college campus and listen to all the rhetoric about courses in survival. No one needs to go to college to study survival, that is instinctive. Students do not need to

pay tuition to learn how to survive; they need an education to learn how to thrive. It is not enough to exist. If we barely exist, we can only help ourselves, at best. It is when we excel that we become resourceful enough to help somebody else. That becomes a measure of greatness. It is not enough to survive. We must thrive. We must raise our sights and not settle for existence, but strive to excel. We must implant within our children the notion that life, at its bottom line, is not so much your aptitude as it is your attitude that determines your altitude. That is the bottom line, altitude.

It is basically the incline of our mind that determines the heights that we reach. Picture yourself in a Piper Cub, a one-seater airplane. It would be better to have your attitude inclined upward, than to be in a 747 with your attitude pointed downward. It is not so much what you have and where you come from, as it is the incline of your mind. We have seen over and over again those who have taken much and who have done little with it, because of the incline of their minds. Others have taken little and have done much with it. Fundamentally, it is not because of their ethnicity, or their sex, or their previous condition of servitude, but because of the incline of their minds. So many of us become so immersed in particular trees, my tree and my friend's tree, that there is too little regard for the forest, and the circumstances under which we function.

The death of ethics is the sabotage of excellence. Where there are no ethical standards, excellence is not likely to be achieved. We are still suffering from the effects of the Viet Nam war and the trauma of Watergate. On the surface we appear to be healed when the Democrats and Republicans shake hands and sit on committees and eat at the White House. But I am here to suggest that the tragic effect of that war is not merely the fact that one president could not run for office again, and another could not complete his term, but that the hopes and aspirations of our youth were bludgeoned. In the absence of moral authority in high places, combined with the assassinations of the Kennedys and King, a psychological rebellion set in that manifested itself in immoral permissiveness and spiritual decay.

Immoral permissiveness is not to be confused with liberal thought, over and against conservative thought. For that which is immorally permissive is irresponsible and has no ethical foundation. Liberalism speaks of more options and the willingness to risk more and adventure more, over and against conservative thought. But immoral permissiveness must not be attached to basic liberal thought. We began to glorify hustling, killing, robbing, rape, pregnancy epidemic among teenage girls, the rise in alcoholism, the nationalizing of dope, and many of our schools becoming centers of distribution, while children lose their goals in life. That is not liberal; that is decadent. It has no foundation and no place in life. If a young man will wear his hat in the classroom because he did not

comb his hair, he probably did not brush his teeth, and he probably did not bathe, and it is likely that he did not do his homework. Order is as contagious as chaos. Order is inherent in the whole process and thus it is not enough to teach reading and writing and counting. Somehow, the rigid division of labor allows the life substance to fall between the chairs. Order is the prerequisite to democracy. There can be no democracy if there is not order. Unless and until this generation is resurrected from this moral abyss and a new moral tone is established for the nation, all of our resources will be poured into a giant bucket that has a hole in it. What does it really matter if the doors of opportunity swing wide open, but you are too drunk to stagger through? What does it really matter if you have a new book or an old book, if you open neither? So, it is important that we teach intellect. Probably more important that we teach priorities, for if your priorities are in order, we will pursue intellect, moral strength, and stamina. If we have access to intellectual options but our priorities are confused, we teach intellect.

I have struggled a long time, climbing this mountain of opportunity, and I believe in it. I believe in the 14th amendment. I believe that buses may be used as a means to desegregate schools. I believe that we should have equal funding for public education everywhere. We must begin to look at our secondary schools in terms of metropolitan plans, not just city plans. We can not have suburban areas that are around inner cities like donuts, where if you are out in the suburbs just across the line and you are in the dough, you have sweetness and the sugar and the options. And if you are in the inner city and you are in the hole, you have nothing. I believe we must be freed out of that hole onto the dough or turn a doughnut into a cookie. I believe in opportunity, but I know that opportunity is not sufficient for the young. Opportunity, as tough as the mountain is to climb, must be accompanied with atmosphere; atmosphere, so that we may have the opportunity to leave that door. If the hall is full of smoke and poisonous fumes, we can not take advantage of the opportunity. I listen to the radio, and the songs are, "Shake your Booty," "Ain't that a Bitch," "The Bitch is Back," "Give Me Some Head," or "It's All Right to Make on the First Night," or I switch on television to "Kojak," and "Police Story" and learn how to kill without cause and how a problem no matter how difficult, can be solved in an hour with breaks for commercials. It suggests a level of superficial living and superficial findings. People who are products of that begin to engage in intercourse without discourse and have no capacity to grapple with life.

Most of us in higher education have missed the effects of the communication revolution. This is the first generation that has seen more than 15,000 hours of television by the time it is seventeen years of age, compared to just 11,000 hours of school—considering those strikes—and less than 3,000 hours of church, assuming it goes to church at all. It

means that by the time this generation is twenty, the only activity that it will have engaged in more than watching television will have been sleep. Thus, the media, quantitatively, has more access to the minds of this generation than does home, church, and school combined. Quantitatively, the impressions are deeper. What does this mean? It means that home is still basically responsible for discipline, church is still basically responsible for the moral tone, and school is basically responsible for being the primary distributor of information. But your responsibility is increasing while your power is diminishing. Whereas the media is, in fact, a primary distributor of information; it is the tone setter, it sets the values, the folkways and the morals. It is the primary teacher and it is the extended family. So if our home, church, and school have increased responsibility but decreased power, the media has expanded its power and its resistance to accept moral and ethical responsibility. It tells us that it is an entertainment medium, and it tells the advertisers that they are a sales source, that they can sell anything and nothing, if they pay their bills. It is right. It has power far beyond the comprehension of most educators, because, at best, you are reading or listening to the easy music on FM100. But I am here to tell you, on the other end of the dial, that the people whose minds you are competing for, you are losing. We must first get the students' attention, and then deal with attendance and then attitude and then achievement. We do not even have their attention; that is why they do not attend, and that is why we do not affect their attitudes, and that is why they do not achieve.

I challenge you in a certain kind of way about not bending rules but lifting folk to the rule. Do not let them remain crippled because they are weak. Use your educated backbone to reach further, but do not compromise your reach, because life is demanding that they grow. Your challenge, since you have been privileged to grow far and above the average, is to be willing to use your commitment to excellence to make them grow, oftentimes in spite of themselves.



THE CONFERENCE LOGO

The Conference logo was conceived to appropriately reflect the thrust of remedial-developmental studies. The "X" through the three "R's," readin', ritin', and 'rithmetic, is meant to symbolize the eradication of poor basic skills, while the "RWA," reading, writing, and arithmetic, represent the importance of effective preparation in the basic skills. The logo also symbolizes the emphasis on remedial-developmental studies and a rededication to the teaching of basic skills.